

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

6 * * *

7 EDGAR AVITIA DE LA VEGA,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 AYMAN ENTERPRISES, INC., *et al.*,

11 Defendants.
12

Case No. 2:23-cv-00865-RFB-MDC

ORDER

13
14 Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 51) of
15 the Honorable Maximiliano D. Couvillier, III, United States Magistrate Judge, entered on June
16 20, 2025. For the following reasons, the Court adopts the Report and Recommendation in full.

17 A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
18 recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A party may file specific
19 written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate judge. 28 U.S.C. §
20 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been filed the district court is
21 required to “make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed
22 findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local
23 Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, a district court is not required to conduct
24 “any review,” *de novo* or otherwise, of the report and recommendations of a magistrate judge.
25 Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Here, objections were due by July 7, 2025. No
26 objections have been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the
27 Magistrate Judge’s recommendation.

28 ///

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant Clarence Eugene Mitchell II's answer, witness statements, and unverified discovery responses are **STRICKEN**. Defendant Mitchell is further **PRECLUDED** from being called as a witness at trial. Defendant Ayman Enterprises, Inc.'s answer will not be stricken.

DATED: July 16, 2025.

- 2 -